

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated March 1, 2005 contained a final rejection of claims 1-22. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11 and 21. Claims 1-22 are in the case. Please consider the present amendment with the attached Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. This amendment is in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.114. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

The Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner to overcome this rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner to overcome this rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lippman (U.S. Patent No. 6,544,042).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The newly amended claims now include a feedback generator configured to review the content and dynamically and automatically gather and assemble targeted marketing feedback information based on the review and append the feedback information to the received content before forwarding the content to a requesting user.

In contrast, the Lippman reference simply discloses an online practice testing system that "...recommends appropriate study aids to the consumer based upon the consumer's score..." (see Abstract of Lippman). In Lippman, once the consumer completes the practice test, the "...consumer then has the option of electronically purchasing the recommended study aid through the system..." However, Lippman does not disclose, teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed feedback generator that reviews the content and dynamically and automatically gathers and assembles targeted marketing feedback information based on the review and appends the feedback

Serial No.: 09/741,285
Attorney Docket No.: 10002475-1


information to the received content. Therefore, since Lippman does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicant's claims, Lippman cannot render the Applicant's invention obvious.

With regard to the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at **(818) 885-1575**. Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: June 1, 2005



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicant
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX